Phtonists in this point, he tells us, that tlie ancient orthodox Fathers of the Christian church, were generally of no other persuasion than this—-that that essence or substance of the Godhead, which all the three persons, or hypostases in, as each of them is God, was not one singular or individual, but only one common or universal essence or substance.

' This, (says Mr. Wise,) and other assertions of the like nature in Dr. Cudworth's Intellectual System, have made so much noise in the world, that there has hardly been a pamphlet 0r book written for some years about the blessed trinity, especially in England, and in the heterodox way, which does not bring in Dr. Cud worth upon the stage, and vouch his name and quotation for its purpose. While, on the other hand, the truly orthodox (though' often through a misunderstand* ing of bis sensej do aim at his doctrine, as a mark of their invectives; and others, who call themselves also by that name, entertaining no little veneration for the very words used by the ancient Fathers, especially when repeated and revived by so learned a person as JDr, Cudworth, and resolving, whatever should come of it* to stand by have unhappily fallen into a kind of Trithtttsm." Mr* Wise therefore endeavours, as much as possible, *to* clear np and justify our Author's doctrine. However, Mr. Robert Nelson, in his life of Bishop Bull,* declares, that Dr- Cud worth's notion, with i^egard to the Trinity, was the same with Pr* Samuel Clarke's, and represents it in the following terms:—That the three persons of the trinity arc* three distinct spiritual substances; but that the

* **Sec. Ixi. p, 330,340, edit** London, **1714,** if*